PUBLICATIONS

OF

The Colonial Society of Massachusetts

VOLUME X

TRANSACTIONS

1904–1906

BOSTON
PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY
1907

upon some occasion before y^e^ grattings, was with a seele of y^e^ shipe throwne into [the] sea.[1]

These three instances have been chosen because they illustrate the danger of interference with the original text. In the first instance, editorial "correction" has deprived us of a form of distinct etymological value; in the second, it has caused a dialect word to disappear altogether and in its place has substituted a quite different word; while in the third, it has changed a well-known sea term into an allusion to a town.

These instances show, I think, that there is but one safe rule to be pursued in editing old manuscripts and books, — namely, to print or reprint the original text so far as that can be done, relegating conjectures as to possible or probable errors to the footnotes. This was Dr. Dexter's method, and though he himself erred in his comment on "brief," yet we are all human, and he at least restored the word to the place from which it had been ousted by Stiles and by Drake.

The reading of this paper was followed by a discussion in which President KITTREDGE, Mr. ANDREW MCFARLAND DAVIS, and Mr. LINDSAY SWIFT participated.

Mr. JOHN NOBLE made the following communication:

SOME DOCUMENTARY FRAGMENTS TOUCHING THE WITCHCRAFT EPISODE OF 1692.

Fragments of old records sometimes prove valuable and suggestive, in themselves almost unwritten volumes to be read between the lines; sometimes, and perhaps oftener, dry and meagre, the husks of bygone harvests. The papers brought in to-day may seem of the latter class. They have, however, one possible merit, — they come to light after being buried for years, forgotten and probably unknown, with a multitude of alien companions, victims of the same fate. They may perhaps have another, in that whatever

[1] History of the Plimoth Plantation (1896), p. 46. For a complete discussion of this point, see a paper on the Naming of Hull in the New England Historical and Genealogical Register for April, 1905, lix. 177–186.

savors of witchcraft, by itself or by reminiscence, has somehow a bit of human interest about it. That vague, mysterious phenomenon appeals alike to the believer, the skeptic, the inquirer, and the every-day man; and the interest is of all sorts and shades.

The Salem epidemic of witchcraft has peculiar claims of its own, and any thing connected with it has certain attractions. It was a mere episode, a bubble in the current of Massachusetts history. It was local, short-lived and of slight proportions, and in some aspects has had an undue prominence. It was an occurrence by no means unnatural. It was perhaps rather to be expected. The Colony, though cut off by the estranging ocean, was still a part of the world, sharing its beliefs and its delusions. Conditions here were peculiarly favorable for such an outbreak. Two generations had gone by since the fathers landed. The stress and strain of the early days, engrossing all thoughts and activities, had passed. New ideas and interests had sprung up. New types of men had come into prominence. There was more time for brooding and pondering and noting providences and marvels. Speculation and superstition had new and clearer fields. The times were troublous, there was doubt, distrust, apprehensive foreboding. The situation, — a strip of territory between the sea and the forest with its gloom and mystery, its dangers and terrors both real and imaginary, peopled as it was with a race believed to be the children of Satan and his worshippers, — in itself invited it. Their Bible, as they read it, their code of law, divine and civil, sanctioned or even inculcated a belief in witchcraft and imposed responsibilities and duties, which their clergy were not slow in assuming.

A craze once started spreads like wildfire; — here the stubble though dry was scant, the fire was brisk but narrow and soon burnt itself out. The old papers submitted to-day are few and short. One set has to do with a case briefly referred to in Upham's history of the Salem Witchcraft, that of Elizabeth Colson.

On the fourteenth of May, 1692, warrants were issued against Daniel Andrew; George Jacobs, Jr., and his wife Rebecca; Sarah Buckley, wife of William, and his daughter Mary Whittredge; all of Salem Village; Elizabeth Hart, wife of Isaac of Lynn, and Thomas Farrar, Senior; Elizabeth Colson of Reading and Bethiah Carter of Woburn. Among the records in Essex, Upham finds few papers on file and little of interest relating to the last three

cases.[1] Of these nine persons, two were not found by the Constables, and escaped and found refuge abroad; three were brought in forthwith; and four, of whom one was Elizabeth Colson, were brought in shortly afterwards. The consequences of such bringing in were severe. As to the hardships endured in prison by persons so apprehended, some of the bills of expenses that have been preserved are somewhat suggestive; among them are bills for four pairs of fetters; mending and putting on one pair; making four pair of iron fetters and two pair of handcuffs, and putting them on the legs and hands of sundry persons, all women; eighteen pounds of iron for fetters; chains for two women; shackles for ten prisoners; one pair of irons for another woman; and most of the prisoners so fitted out were confined in jail for nearly a year.

There are two papers touching this case. One is the Deposition of the assistant of the officer sent to arrest her, giving some interesting experiences in the fruitless attempt. There is a slight difference as to date from that given by Upham as the beginning of proceedings. Perhaps this suspect was peculiarly elusive, and this may have been one of a series of attempts, and the interval longer than Upham gives. Whatever interest the old paper has is subjective rather than objective. The story is prosaic and unexciting; the occurrences commonplace; — a race with the natural outcome, — the inevitable cat, — the dog very like the dog of to-day. Simple as the narrative is, it has a touch of the graphic; many New England characteristics come out in it.

Under all, from the right point of view, are the elements of the supernatural. Did the hard-headed old official see and find them? Or did he supply them for his expected market? Why did not he, — and the minions of the law always, — shrink from encountering the wrath and vengeance of the mysterious powers of darkness and the dread possibilities involved in braving them? Did civil responsibility and devotion to duty outweigh natural fears? Or were the men after all rank unbelievers in the delusion? One might spin out any number of questions, psychological and otherwise, wound up in this old yarn. The paper might be made a fruitful text for a profitable sermon.

[1] C. W. Upham, Salem Witchcraft (1867), ii. 187.

The paper follows:

William Arnall of Redding forty three years of age or thereabouts testifieth and Saith, that on y^e^ Sabbath day last being the 4^th^ Instant 7^br^: 92 early in y^e^ morning being [Commanded?] by y^e^ Constable of said Redding J[ohn?] Parker [ ] to assist him in the Execution of his office pursuant to a [warrant] from Major W^m^ Johnson Esq^r^ to apprehend Elisabeth Colson &c. under Suspicion of y^e^ Sin of Witchcraft Then they Coming to y^e^ house of Widow Dastin the Constable opening y^e^ out most dore, and finding y^e^ inner doer fast that he Could not gett in, Called me to him and Said he Could not gett in and as soon as [I Came[1]] I Came to him we heard y^e^ back dore open then I ran behind y^e^ house & [shee[1]] then I saw said Elisab: Colson run from y^e^ back dore and gott over into John Dixes feild and I called to her being not far from her, and asked why she ran away for I would Catch her. She said nothing, but run away and [at last[1]] quickly fell down and got up againe and ran again shaking her hand behinde her as it were strikeing at me, and I ran and seeing I could not gaine ground of her, I sett my dog at her, and he ran round about her, but would not touch her, and runing litle further there was a stone wall and on y^e^ other [bushe[1]] side of it a few bushes y^t^ tooke my sight from her a litle, being but litle behinde her and when I came up to said Bushes I lookt into them, and [Could[1]] Could see no thing of her, and running on further there was great Cat Came running towards me, and stared up in my face, being but a litle distance from me, near a fence. I Endeauoured to sett my dog [up[1]] upon her, and y^e^ dog would not minde her but went y^e^ Contrary way, and on I offering to strike at her w^th^ my stick she seemed to run under y^e^ fence, and so disappeared, and I could get sight of maid nor Cat neither any more. Spending some litle time looking about for her & further Saith not

WILLIAM ARNALL

7^br^. 10^th^: 92

[*Endorsed*]

W^m^ Arnollds Euid [2]

The other paper is a Writ of Habeas Corpus, which tells its own story. It seems to be not the writ so often styled the bulwark of liberty, bringing up persons assumed to be unjustly in restraint or confinement, with a view to their deliverance, but a writ to bring

[1] Cancelled in the original.

[2] Suffolk Court Files, no. 162, 281.

persons confined in the Middlesex jail before the proper tribunal in another county, for a trial or final disposition of the cases.

It runs as follows:

Province of the Massachusets Bay in New=England

Mid^{x} ss^{t} William and Mary by the Grace of God King and Queen of England Scottland France and Ireland Defend^{r} of y^{e} Faith &c. to the Sheiriffe of the County of Midlesex Greeting Wee Command you that you haue the Body of Lidia Dastin of Reading widow Sarah Dastin single-woman Mary Coulson widow Elizabeth Colson single w$\tilde{o}$: all of Reading and Sarah Cole of Lyn in the prison of Cambridge vnder yo^{r} Custody as tis said Detained, and vnder safe and sure Conduct together wth the cause of their Caption vnder what name or names soever the said Lidia Dastin Sarah Dastin Mary Coulson Elizabeth Coulson and Sarah Cole, be Censured, in the same before o^{r} Justices of o^{r} Court of Assize and Goal Delivery at Salem in o^{r} County of Essex in o^{r} Province of the Massachusets Bay in New-England vpon Tusday the 3^{d} Day of Jan$\tilde{y}$ next in y^{e} fourth year of o^{r} Reigne To Do and receiue all and Every of those things w^{ch} the Justices of o^{r} Court shall Consider of in that behalfe. And then and there you haue this Writt Wittness William Stoughton Esq^{r} in Boston the 31st Decem$\tilde{b}$. In y^{e} fourth year of o^{r} Reigne Annoq Dom$\tilde{i}$. 1692

JON^{A} ELATSON, *Cl$\tilde{e}$r:*

By Vertue of this Writt I haue hear Brought y^{e} Bodyes of those Persons within Spesefyd and Deliuerd hear att Salem to the under Sheriffe

Per me TIM^{O} PHILLIPS *Sheriffe for Midd^{x}*

[*Endorsed*]

The Returne of y^{e} Habes Corpus from y^{e} [Sher[1]] Sheiriffe of Midlesex[2]

Three of the persons named in the Writ were tried, as appears by the following:

Sarah Cole Verdict "That the said Sarah Cole was Not Guilty of the felony by Witchcraft for w^{ch} shee stood Indicted in and by the said Indictment The Court Order the said Sarah Cole to be discharged paying her Fees."

In the cases of Lidiah Dastin and Sarah Dastin, was the same verdict.[3]

[1] Cancelled in the original. [2] Suffolk Court Files, no. 2700.

[3] Records of the Superiour Court of Judicature, 1692–1695, folios 34, 35.

What disposition was made of Elizabeth Colson or of Mary, does not appear from the records contained in this volume.

The second series of papers concerns the case of Philip English and his wife Mary — a sort of aftermath, at the end of some fifty years, of a case somewhat famous from certain circumstances connected with it. Upham gives "some explanation of the causes that exposed Mr. English to hostility," and some of the evidence offered against him. He was one of the leading citizens, and "having many landed estates in various places, and extensive business transactions, he was liable to frequent questions of litigation."[1] That he was involved in lawsuits and a hard and persistent fighter, the Court records plainly show. One of the suits was concerning the bounds of a piece of land in Marblehead, and his adversary there was later active in bringing accusations of witchcraft against him. Mary English, wife of Philip, was one of nine named in warrants issued April twenty-first; all to be delivered to the magistrates "for examination at the house of Lieutenant Nathaniel Ingersoll, at about ten o'clock the next morning, in Salem Village."[2] She was committed to prison. On April thirtieth, a warrant was taken out against English and several others; it bears the endorsement: "Mr. Philip English not being to be found," signed by the initials of the Marshal.[3] Why he was not found appears in one of this series of papers. On the sixth of May a warrant was procured at Boston, to the Marshal-General or his lawful deputy to apprehend him wherever found within the jurisdiction and convey him to the custody of the Marshal of Essex. Mr. Upham's account[4] says he was delivered to the Marshal of Essex on the thirtieth of May and after examination before the Magistrates the next day committed to prison; that he and his wife escaped from jail and found refuge in New York until the proceedings were terminated, when they returned to Salem and there continued to live; and that the wife survived but a short time the shock of the accusation, the dangers to which she had been exposed, and the sufferings of imprisonment. Their social position was of the highest. He was a merchant of large estate, extensive business, and owned fourteen buildings in town, a wharf and twenty-one

[1] Upham, Salem Witchcraft, ii. 141.
[2] *Ibid.* ii. 128. [3] *Ibid.* ii. 140 [4] *Ibid.* ii. 142.

vessels; she a lady of eminent character and culture, the only child and heir of Richard Hollingsworth. Upham's history has for the frontispiece of the second volume a picture of the English house. The autographs given indicate the character attributed to them.

In his Supplement Mr. Upham[1] gives a record of Court showing an adjustment of the accounts of George Corwin, High-Sheriff of Essex, and an order discharging him from all liabilities imposed upon him by reason of the Sheriff's office, passed 15 May, 1694; and further says that later Mr. English compelled the executors of the Sheriff to pay over to him £60. 3s. In May, 1709, an address was presented to the General Court for the passage of an Act to restore the reputations of the sufferers by the witchcraft persecution and reparation for the damages suffered by their estates, signed by Philip English and twenty-one others. The Act of 2 November, 1711, gave relief, not general, but only to such as had petitioned.[2]

What gave interest to the case of English was its peculiar circumstances, — the standing of the parties, the causes that may have led to his prosecution, the fact that it was never brought to trial, and especially his hiding and concealment and ultimate escape.

The two papers given here bear upon the last point. They are found in a case contained in the Suffolk Files, brought in 1738 against the then representative of English, by the representative of the man who befriended him at the time of his arrest and imprisonment, to recover for the expenses then incurred. The case itself is merely for the recovery of a debt, and only these two papers have any direct connection with the witchcraft episode, and explain some incidents then in question. They are both Depositions used in evidence in the case and bear the underscoring of counsel to mark important facts therein.

The first is as follows:

Margaret Casnoe of Lawfull Age Testifieth & saith that in part of the Time when there was so much talk of the Witchcraft in this Country

[1] Upham, Salem Witchcraft, ii. 472.

[2] An Act to Reverse the Attainders of George Burroughs and others for Witchcraft, Private Act No. 26 (Massachusetts Province Laws, vi. 71, 72).

and severall persons suffered therefor being according to [the best of[1]] this Deponents Rememberance about forty five years agone this Depon[t] then being about Eighteen years of Age Livd with M[rs] Margaret Pastre In the House & Family of M[r] George Hollard in Boston and at that Time M[r] Philip English of Salem and his wife being under Suspicion for the aforesaid Crime She was then taken up and put into Boston Goal & he the s[d] M[r] Philip English came to Boston & Requested the afores[d] [M[r][1]] George Hollard to take him into his House who accordingly did & maintaind him there Secretly for some Time & the s[d] Hollards house being searched for the s[d] English he was hid behind a bag with Dirty Cloths by which means he Escaped then being taken and afterwards when he was put into prison for Witchcraft & his Estate and Effects thereupon Seizd s[d] M[r] Hollard Supported Said M[r] English & his Wife in Goal & this Depon[t] often & frequently carried victuals & provisions from s[d] M[r] Hollards house & by his orders deliverd the same to the s[d] English & his Wife in prison. And the s[d] Englishes Family wanting Subsistance when brought up to Boston his Effects being seizd this Depon[t] well Remembers that M[rs] Mary English Daughter to s[d] Philip English Livd at s[d] M[r] George Hollards and was by him maintained & Supported for a Considerable Time (this Depon[t] is not Certain how long) But s[d] M[r] Hollard maintaind & Supported the s[d] Mary English for a Considerable Time after the Rest of said English's family were gone from Thence

Sig
MARGARET × CASNOE

Boston July 8[th] 1738
Sworne to in Inf[r] Court
Boston 18 July 1738

Att[r] EZEK[L] GOLDTHWAIT *Cler.*

A True Copy Exam[d]
Per EZEK[L] GOLDTHWAIT *Cler*

[*Endorsed*]
Casnoes Depocon[2]

The second Deposition runs thus:

SALEM Feb[y] 12, 1738

Susanah Touzel [of ful Age Testyfyeth &[1]] Saith that [in the year 1692[1]] she was carried from Her Father Phillip Englishs House To

---

[1] Interlined in the original.

[2] Suffolk Court Files, no. 47120:8. The original deposition is no. 46720:2. "Pastree Exec[x] of Hollard & English Adm[r] of English, July 1738." See also Record Superiour Court of Judicature for Suffolk County, 8 August, 1738, fol. 181.

M^{r} Arnolds the Goal Keeper and livd there wth my Father Phillip English & Wife while they continued there and when they left the Goal She was carried to Cap^{t} Jn^{o} Aldens to Board and Continued there till the s^{d} Phillip English and Wife returnd from N York to their own Dwelling in Salem and then they Sent for her home

SUSANNA TOUZEL

ESSEX ss. SALEM Feb: 12th 1738

Then M^{rs} Susañah Towzell (who by reason of Sickness & bodily Infirmity is incapable of Traveling to Court) made oath to the truth of the within Deposition She being carefully Examined & Cautioned to Declare the whole Truth, (The Adverse party whom this may Concern, living more than Twenty mile not being notifyed)

Jurat Coram

BEN^{E} LYNDE Jun^{r} *Jus^{t} Pac^{t}*

[*Endorsed*]

Susañah Towzells Deposition
Taken before Ben^{e} Lynde J^{r}.[1]

Not as strictly germane to these papers, but as connected with the general subject and having some bearing upon considerations already offered, it may not be out of place to add a memorandum showing the history of witchcraft as it appears in the records of the highest Court of Massachusetts. It is not intended to touch here upon the trials held in the Special Court of Oyer and Terminer created nominally under the new Charter, but whose validity has been well questioned. A full account of its creation and its doings is to be found in Washburn's Sketches of the Judicial History of Massachusetts.

The Records of the Court of Assistants, extant and accessible, from 1630 to 1673 are few and incomplete. In these no case of witchcraft is found. One case, however, said to be the earliest, that of Margaret Jones of Charlestown convicted and executed in 1648, is mentioned by Winthrop.[2] Another is that of Anne Hibbins in 1656, memorable in its circumstances and for the controversy which occurred between the Bench and the Jury. The Jury found her guilty, the Magistrates refused to accept the ver-

[1] Suffolk Court Files, no. 48343. See also no. 48342 (3 papers): "English Admr. & Pastree Exec^{r} of Hollard Feb. 1738–9."

[2] History of New England (1853), ii. 326.

dict. The case was carried to the General Court; popular clamor was effective and she was convicted and executed.[1] William F. Poole says that twelve persons were executed in New England before 1692, six of whom were in Connecticut. Besides the two previously mentioned, Jones and Hibbins, he gives the cases of the wife of Henry Lake of Dorchester in 1650, Mary Parsons, wife of Hugh, of Springfield in 1651, and of a Cambridge woman at about the same time. He also has the case of Goody Glover of Boston, in 1688.[2] Rather curiously the last case does not appear in the Records of the Court of Assistants, 1673 to 1692, nor is it in the Massachusetts Colony Records. There are some dozen papers touching on witchcraft in the early Suffolk Court Files, between 1652 and 1666, and a large number in 1692 and shortly after. The Records of the Court of Assistants from 1673 to 1692 are full and complete. In this volume six cases appear.

In 1673 Anna Edmonds was "Complajned on by Samuell Bennett & his wife on suspition of witchcraft After the Court had heard all the euidences produced against her the Court declared that they saw no Ground to fix any charge against her & so dismist hir," ordering the complainants to "pay the charges of the wittnesses in y^e^ case = thirty shillings & ffees."[3]

In the next year was the somewhat famous case of Mary Parsons of Northampton, recorded at length, with the result that "the Jury . . . found hir not Guilty = & so she was dischardged."[4]

In 1680 Elizabeth Morse was indicted for "not hauing the feare of God before hir eyes being Instigated by the diuil & hauing had familiarity w^th^ the diuil contrary to the peace of our Souaigne Lord the King his croune & dignity y^e^ lawes of God & of this Jurisdiction," tried and found "Guilty according to Indictment & had sentenc."[5] There is a hint of unwritten pathos about her case, for the next year in answer to a petition of her husband and to her own, "The Court Judgeth it meet to Repreive the sajd Elizabeth morse the Condemned prisoner to the end of the next session in Octobe, and in the meantime order hir dismission from the prison in Boston

[1] See Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts (1764), i. 187.

[2] Memorial History of Boston, ii. 133–142 and *notes;* Paige, History of Cambridge, pp. 355, 595.

[3] Records of the Court of Assistants (1901), i. 11.

[4] *Ibid.* i. 33.

[5] *Ibid.* i. 159.

to Returne home w^th^ hir husband to Newbery Prouided she goe not aboue sixteen Rods from hir Oune house & land at any time except to the meeting house in Newbery nor remoove from the place Appointed hir by the minister & selectmen to sitt in whilst there."[1] Her name does not appear thereafter and it may be hoped the reprieve was final.

Another case in 1680 was that of "Mary Hale of Boston widdow" indicted "for that yow no^t^ hauing the feare of God before yo^r^ eyes and being Instigated by the divill hauing had familiarity w^th^ him by the abhorred sin & art of witchcraft did kill & bewitch one [Michael] Smit to death," and found "Not Guilty according to Indictment."[2]

There were two cases in 1683. James Fuller of Springfield was indicted for familiarity with the devil. He seems to have made a confession, but on being brought to trial, "After the Indictment & euidence produced against him was Read he owning the charge as sajd by him but denyed the trueth of it saying he had belyed himselfe his examination & [confession being] committed to the Jury," they found him "not Guilty according to Indictment." He was not, however, to go scot-free. "The Court Consi[der]ing of his wicked & pernicious willfull lying & Continuanc in it till now putting the Country to so great a charge sentenct the sajd James ffuller to be seuerely whipt w^th^ thirty stripes seuerely lajd on & that he pay fiue pounds mony to the Tresure^r^ of the Country to dischardg the chardges of his triall paying fees of Court stands Committed till the sentence be pformd. and that in Case y^e^ s^d^ fiue pounds be not p^d^ by y^e^ s^d^ ffuller w^th^in a month Its left w^th^ y^e^ Tresure^r^ of y^e^ Country to ship him of & dispose of him as he Cann not exceeding fower yeares to Ans^r^ the charges."[3] Later in the year Mary Webster of Hadley "hauing binn presented for suspition of witchcraft . . . & left to furthe^r^ Tryall" was "brought to the barr" and indicted for having "as in & by seuerall testimonjes may Appeare" had familiarity with the devil "in the Shape of a warraneage," and the existence of the secret infallible physical signs are set forth.[4] The jury, however, found her not

[1] Records of the Court of Assistants, i. 189, 190.
[2] *Ibid.* i. 188, 189.
[3] *Ibid.* i. 228, 229.
[4] *Ibid.* i. 229, 233.

guilty. The use in the charge of the Indian name for a black cat "warraneage" is interesting and suggestive in several ways.

No case of witchcraft appears between 1683 and 1692; and the issue of the six cases given above is noticeable — all trials in the Colonial Court of Assistants.

This Court was succeeded in the time of the Province by the Superiour Court of Judicature. In the first volume of its Records, 1692–1695, the following cases of witchcraft appear:

Superiour Court of Judicature, Court of Assizes & Generall Goal Delivery, holden at Salem in the County of Essex, Province of Mass. Bay in New England in America, 3 Jan. 1692–3

Present.

The Hon^{ble} William Stoughton Esq^{r} Chief Justice.
Thomas Danforth Esq^{r} } John Richards Esq^{r}
Wait Winthrop Esq^{r} } Samuel Sewell Esq^{r}

In over fifty cases before it, the Grand Jury ignored the majority and only twenty-one persons were tried and indicted for felony by witchcraft, with the results given:

Rebekah Jacobs wife of George Jacobs of Salem.	Not Guilty. Discharged by paying fees.
Margaret Jacobs of Salem single-woman.	
Sarah Buckley wife of W^{m} Buckley of Salem.	
Mary Witheridge of Salem.	
Job Tookey of Beverly.	
Hannah Tyler of Andover.	
Candy a Negro servant to Mrs. Mary Hawkes of Salem	
Mary Marston wife of John Marston Jun^{r} of Andover	
Elisabeth Johnson of Andover.	
Abigaill Barker wife of Ebenezar Barker of Andover	
Mary Tyler wife of Hopestill Tyler of Andover	

Sarah Wardwell of Andover.	Guilty.	The Court ordered the Keeper of the Goal to take care of the prisoner, according to law.
Sarah Hawkes of Andover.	Not Guilty.	The Court ordered Mary [1] Hawkes aforesaid to be discharged, paying her fees.
Marcy Wardwell of Andover.	Not Guilty.	Discharged by paying fees.
Elisabeth Johnson, Junr. of Andover.	Guilty.	The Court ordered the Keeper of the Goal to take care of the prisoner according to law.
Mary Bridges wife of John Bridges of Andover	Not Guilty.	Discharged by paying fees.
Mary Post of Rowley.	Guilty.	The Court ordered the keeper of the Goal to take care of the prisoner according to law.
Hannah Post of Boxford Sarah Bridges of Andover. Mary Osgood wife of Capt. John Osgood of Andover Mary Lacey Junr. of Andover.	Not Guilty.	Discharged by paying fees.

There were three convictions and eighteen acquittals.

At the term of the Sup. Court of Jud. &c. held at Charlestown in the County of Middlesex, 31 Jan. 1692–3.

Present.

WILLIAM STOUGHTON, Esqr. Chief Justice.
THOMAS DANFORTH, Esqr.
JOHN RICHARDS, Esqr.
WAIT WINTHROP, Esqr.
SAMUEL SEWELL, Esqr.

---

[1] So in the original.

Feb. 1st. All but ye Chief Justice Present.

Mary Toothaker of Billerica. Mary Taylor of Reding wife of Sebread Taylor Sarah Cole wife of John Cole of Lynn Lidiah Dastin of Reding. Sarah Dastin of Reding.	Not Guilty. Discharged by paying fees.

The last three cases are referred to in connection with the paper on Elizabeth Colson.

Sup. Court of Jud. &c. held at Boston for the County of Suffolk 25 April 1693.

Present.

WILLIAM STOUGHTON, Esqr. Chief Justice.
THOMAS DANFORTH, Esqr.
JOHN RICHARDS, Esqr.
SAMUEL SEWELL, Esqr.

John Alden of Boston, "suspition of Witchcraft," appeared and was discharged by proclamation.

Sup. Court of Jud. &c. held at Ipswich, May 1693.

Present.

THOMAS DANFORTH, Esqr.
JOHN RICHARDS, Esqr.
SAMUEL SEWELL, Esqr.

Susanah Post of Andover. Eumice Frie of Andover wife of John Frie Mary Bridges, Junior, of Andover. Mary Barker of Andover. William Barker, Jr. of Andover.	Not Guilty. Discharged by paying fees.

Of the thirty-two persons tried in the Superiour Court of Judicature, — twenty-six in Essex, five in Middlesex, and one in Suffolk, — twenty-nine were acquitted and three found guilty, the last all in

Essex. In the second volume, which brings the Records of this Court down to 1700, no case of witchcraft is found. The year 1693 practically closed the judicial history.

Mr. ANDREW MCFARLAND DAVIS called attention to the use of the words "The Rhode Island Land Bank" in the printed Transactions of the February meeting, 1900 (VI. 380). The same words are used in the Table of Contents of the volume. The Index also has an entry, "Rhode Island Land Bank."

The Rhode Island "banks" referred to in the paper submitted at that meeting were mere emissions of Colonial currency, which were loaned to citizens, hence the name "banks." They were not what is generally understood by the term "Land Bank." The use of the word "land" as a descriptive epithet in connection with these banks is, therefore, to a certain extent misleading.

Mr. THOMAS MINNS spoke of the service on the previous evening at the First Church in Boston, in dedication of six mural tablets that have recently been placed there in memory of Governor John Endicott, Anne Hutchinson, Sir Henry Vane the younger, Governor John Leverett, Governor Simon Bradstreet, and Anne Bradstreet, all of whom were members of that Church.

Mr. NOBLE read a letter from Dr. DANIEL COIT GILMAN, a Corresponding Member, presenting to the Society a set of the Fund Publications of the Maryland Historical Society and a set of the Archives of Maryland. The gift was gratefully accepted.

Mr. HORACE EVERETT WARE of Milton was elected a Resident Member.

Dr. CHARLES MONTRAVILLE GREEN communicated a Memoir of SAMUEL WELLS, which he had been requested to prepare for publication in the Transactions of the Society.